

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ANTIONETTE SLAUGHTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

VALLEY VIEW I LLP, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C24-273RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Pro se Plaintiff Antoinette Slaughter was granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this matter on February 28, 2024. Dkt. #4. The Complaint has been posted on the docket. #5. Summonses have not yet been issued. The Court has now determined that this case must be reviewed prior to issuing summonses.

Ms. Slaughter brought a case against these same Defendants last year. *See* Case No. C23-1360-JLR. Judge Robart summarized the facts of that case:

Ms. Slaughter initiated this action based on an apparent dispute with Valley View, the management company of her apartment building, and its employees. (*See, e.g.*, Compl. at 6, 9-14, 26-27, 36-37.) Ms. Slaughter alleges Valley View and its employees have subjected her to harassment, retaliation, and discrimination—including by commencing eviction proceedings against her—in response to a fair housing complaint she lodged with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) and various other government agencies. (*Id.* at 6, 9-14, 43-45.) Ms.

1 Slaughter also alleges that Valley View and its employees engaged
2 in “[u]nfair, abusive, and deceptive management practices,”
3 “[r]ight to privacy violations,” “[h]ostile living [e]nvironment,”
4 “[e]motional [a]buse,” “[p]oor communication,” and “falsifying
5 documents.” (*Id.* at 26-27, 36-37, 39.) Ms. Slaughter raises
6 additional claims against KCHA, Mayor Harrell, Mr. Brooks, and
7 Seattle Public Schools either for “[c]onflict of [i]nterest” under
8 RCW 43.160.040 or for “[f]ostering discriminatory conduct.” (*Id.*
9 at 3, 34-35, 38.) Generally, Ms. Slaughter brings her claims under
42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging the Defendants violated her equal
protection rights under the Fourteenth Amendment. (*Id.* at 5.) The
court also construes Ms. Slaughter’s complaint as raising
discrimination and retaliation claims under the Fair Housing Act
(“FHA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601-19, 3631. Ms. Slaughter requests
damages in the amount of \$100,000,000. (*Id.* at 7.)

10 Case No. C23-1360-JLR, Dkt. #5 at 2–3. Judge Robart struggled with Ms. Slaughter’s failure
11 “to include specific factual allegations regarding when she filed her various complaints and the
12 subject matter of those complaints,” noted that there are several “incomplete documents”
13 attached to the complaint, and ruled that “it is not the court’s duty to sort through Ms.
14 Slaughter’s complaint and documents in order to piece together the basis of her claim.” *Id.* at 6
15 (citing *Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington*, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003)). Judge
16 Robart dismissed Ms. Slaughter’s claims because: a) “Ms. Slaughter fails to provide sufficient
17 detail of the facts supporting her [FHA] retaliation claim;” b) she failed to provide “facts
18 showing that she belongs in a class of persons protected under the FHA and that she is entitled
19 to relief under either a disparate treatment or disparate impact theory;” c) she failed to allege
20 facts sufficient to show “Valley View’s conduct amounts to state action” so as to support a §
21 1983 claim; d) KCHA and Seattle Public Schools are not proper Defendants in a § 1983 action;
22 and e) “the complaint names Mayor Harrell and Mr. Brooks as Defendants but fails to provide
23 any facts regarding the acts they allegedly committed that Ms. Slaughter contends violated her
24
25
26
27
28

1 rights.” *Id.* at 4–13. That case was ultimately dismissed for failure to amend within the
2 deadline set by Judge Robart.

3 This Court will dismiss a Complaint at any time if the action fails to state a claim, raises
4 frivolous or malicious claims, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from
5 such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
6

7 Ms. Slaughter has now brought this second case against the same Defendants. She
8 acknowledges her prior case. Dkt. #5 at 3. She alleges the Court has jurisdiction under the 14th
9 Amendment. *Id.* at 5. The new lawsuit contains even fewer factual details than the first one.
10 Under “Statement of Claim,” Ms. Slaughter states “discrimination, retaliation, harassment
11 violence against women (stalking) denial of a reasonable accommodation interference with
12 rental assistance.” *Id.* at 6. The first incident occurred June 2, 2020, and the most recent
13 incident was February 1, 2024. *Id.* Although the Court is given these dates, there are no
14 descriptions of the incidents. Under “Injuries” she alleges “psychological trauma, emotional
15 exhaustion, mental and emotional duress caused my (family) [sic], anxiety, disregard of my
16 disability (air quality), embarrassment, humiliation and pain and suffering.” *Id.* at 7. She is
17 seeking \$100,000,000 in relief. *Id.* There are no further factual details in the Complaint. Ms.
18 Slaughter has attached a 15-page exhibit. Dkt. #5-1. This exhibit appears to contain a “30-day
19 Notice to Pay Rent or Vacate the Premises” from last December, an “Amended Housing
20 Discrimination Complaint” drafted by Plaintiff last May, a letter to Judge Robart from last
21 October, a letter to Seattle Mayor Bruce Harrell, and several other similar letters to various
22 Defendants, some of which appear to be incomplete. *Id.*
23
24
25

26 The Court believes dismissal is again warranted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) for
27 the above reasons previously identified by Judge Robart. The Complaint filed by Ms.
28

1 Slaughter in this case does not contain adequate information. It is not possible for Defendants
2 to respond without further details. Defendants and the Court cannot piece together Ms.
3 Slaughter's factual and legal allegations by reviewing her statements in letter and prior filings;
4 these allegations must be contained in a single complaint that conforms to Federal Rule of Civil
5 Procedure 8. Furthermore, the Court believes that Judge Robart has correctly identified several
6 undeniable legal problems with this lawsuit. In Response to this Order, Ms. Slaughter must
7 write a short statement telling the Court why each of her claims should not be dismissed for
8 failing to provide sufficient factual detail, failing to state how these facts support the elements
9 of her legal claims, failing to demonstrate how the Court has jurisdiction, failed to allege facts
10 sufficient to show Defendants' conduct amounts to state action so as to support a § 1983 claim,
11 and failing to name the proper Defendants in a § 1983 action. **This Response may not exceed**
12 **six double-spaced (6) pages.** Attachments or amended pleadings are not permitted. The Court
13 will take no further action in this case until Ms. Slaughter has submitted this Response.
14

15
16 Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Ms. Slaughter shall file a
17 Response to this Order to Show Cause containing the detail above **no later than Tuesday,**
18 **April 30, 2024.** Failure to file this Response will result in case dismissal. The Court will not
19 rule on Plaintiff's request for counsel, Dkt. #6, until she has filed the above Response. The
20 Court DIRECTS the Clerk to mail a copy of this Order and a copy of Judge Robart's prior
21 Order, Case No. C23-1360-JLR, Dkt. #5, to Plaintiff.
22

23
24 DATED this 11th day of March, 2024.

25
26 

27 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE